MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
27 June, 1978

AM
10:00 *CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.*

ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: 25 July, 1978
22 August, 1978
26 September, 1978

B. Minutes of May 1978 meeting.

C. D.C. Draft Bill "The Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978".

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

A. General Services Administration

1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Renovation.

B. Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Electromagnetic Development Laboratory, Phase III, Naval Research Laboratory.

C. Veterans Administration

New Logo.

D. D.C. Department of Transportation

C & P Telephone Enclosures, New Design.

E. D.C. Department of Economic Development

Old Georgetown Act

1. OG 78-113, 3285 M Street, N.W., Townhouses above Retail/Commercial Space - Resubmission.

2. OG 78-116, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., New Residential Building - Resubmission.

3. OG 78-117, 1044 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Addition and Alteration - Resubmission.

4. OG 78-118, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., New Office/Apartment and Garage Building.

5. Appendix 1.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. SL 78-47, 1922 F Street, N.W., Addition to Office Building.

2. SL 78-50, 718 15th Street, N.W., Alteration for Addition of Entrance to Pennsylvania Avenue Facade - Resubmission.

3. SL 78-52, 1718 Crestwood Drive, N.W., New Third Floor Addition.

4. SL 78-53, 2501 M Street, N.W., New Office and Apartment Building.

5. Appendix 2.

F. D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development

Historic Subdivisions

Appendix 3.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

27 June, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 78-89	1611 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Randolph Reed, Jr.	New office building for Reed Electric (resubmission refer to OG 77-155)

ACTION: Issue permit. Submit signs, landscaping, and final architectural details as developed. Preliminary brick samples subject to approval after inspection of panels erected on site. 5/24/78

91	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Georgetown Development Limited Part.	Retention of existing apartment building and addition and alteration (resubmission refer to OG 78-15).

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recomment restudy to minimize impact and disparity of architectural styles facing Wisconsin Avenue. Recommend study of alternatives to entering parking garage from Wisconsin Avenue. 6/1/78

95	3221 M Street, N.W. M Street Associates	Stucco store front brick pillars; reglaze windows; replace doors, etc. (resubmission refer to OG 78-87).

ACTION: Issue permit. Question inswinging doors. 6/8/78.

97	3285 M Street, N.W. Robert N. Wolpe	Construct parking garage, commercial/retail space, and townhouse units (resubmission refer to OG 78-97)

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recomment additional study of M Street shop frontage in terms of more conventional georgetown row building type of facade. Recommend against proposed split-foyer, recessed, two-floor commercial arrangement proposed. Board and Commission commend architect and developer for reduction in height, mass, and new relationship to Potomac and Prospect Street. 6/1/78

100	1044 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Monique Pierredon	Addition and alteration

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend restudy one floor lower with more of a masonry row building type of expression. No objection to curved glass conservatory expression on second floor at corner of Grace Street and Wisconsin. 6/1/78.

102	1529 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Vega Corporation	Construct rear masonry addition (resubmission refer to OG 78-85).

ACTION: Do not issue permit. See attached letter to Mayor Washington. 6/7/78.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 78-103	1661 35th Street, N.W. George Gionis	Two existing signs to remain.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Location and design of signs not recommended. Use of logos advertising specific products not recommended in historic district. 6/8/78.	
104	3307 M Street, N.W. Pier One Imports	Install one single-faced plexiglass letter display, 20" x 23'6" (resubmission refer to OG 78-86).
ACTION:	Do not issue permit for internally illuminated sign in historic district. No objection to size or letter style. 6/8/78.	
106	2811 O Street, N.W. Hugh S. Cumming	5'0 x 5'8" bathroom addition to existing house.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 6/13/78.	
108	1010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. 1010 Wisconsin Associates	Single-faced sign 60" x 34" flat against wall, 5' above sidewalk.
ACTION:	Issue Permit. 6/8/78	
109	1855 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Safeway Stores, Inc.	Construct Safeway store and kiosk (resubmission refer to OG 78-71).
ACTION:	Issue permit. Request on-site sample panel of proposed brick and mortar prior to construction. Recommend that rooftop mechanical equipment be painted neutral light grey. Suggest that utility openings, vents, and grilles be painted similar color to brick. 6/8/78.	
110	3217 Volta Place, N.W. Mr. & Mrs M. Totten	New dormer (front), and skylight (rear).
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Request exact details on dormer; also recommend aligning dormer with paired windows below. No objection to skylight. 6/8/78	
111	1512 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Fotomat Corporation	Install 30" x 40" projecting sign, constructed of plexiglass and aluminum frame (resubmission refer to OG 78-78).
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. No objection to graphic design, location, or projecting sign. A painted wooden sign would be more appropriate to the historic district than plastic. Recommend against the intensity of the orange-yellow color proposed. 6/8/78	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

27 June, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 78-122	3221 M Street, N.W. M Street Association	Remove existing rolling door; fill opening with masonry, stucco; install skyline.
ACTION:	Issue Permit 6/8/78	
119	3307 M Street, N.W. Pier One Imports	Install single-faced 20" x 23'6" sign per sketch (resubmission refer to OG 78-104).
ACTION:	Issue Permit for 25 square foot sign 6/22/78	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

27 June, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
SL 78-44	2116 F Street, N.W. Myer Siegel	Remove existing 7' woven wire fence along alley and replace with 4' concrete fence wall with 3' wire on top.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 5/4/78	
46	718 15th Street, N.W. American Security Bank	Alteration to Pennsylvania Avenue facade of Main Branch to provide entrance on Pennsylvania Avenue.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Recommend additional design study retaining more of the masonry and or masonry character of the existing facade. 6/1/78	
48	509 14th Street, N.W. H. R. Crawford	Securing three temporary banners to outside of building.
ACTION:	Approved as temporary installation, to be removed following D.C. election. 5/30/78	
49	2276 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. Emilie S. Dieterie	Replace garage door with sliding glass door.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 5/26/78	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON HISTORIC SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

27 June, 1978

NO.	SQUARE, LOT, ADDRESS AND OWNER	DESCRIPTION
HS-85	Square 1280, Lot 918 3230 Reservoir Road, N.W. Robert D. Van Roijen, JR.	Conversion of Assessment and Taxation Lot 918 into a Record Lot
ACTION:	See attached letter. 6/6/78	
86	Square 1200, Lot 818 Wisconsin Avenue, M Street, & Warehouse Place, N.W. Donohoe Construction Co., Inc.	Conversion of Assessment and Taxation Lot 818 into a Record lot.
ACTION:	No objection 6/1/78	
	Square 1260, Lot 826 2719 O Street, N.W. Caroline C. Ramsay	Conversion of Assessment and Taxation Lot 826 into a Record Lot.
ACTION:	No objection provided proposed addition plans are approved by CFA as having no adverse impact on adjacent residences. 6/1/78	
90	Square 1278, Lot 216 3336, 3338,3340 Dent Place, N.W. American National Red Cross, and Trustees of the National Gallery of Art	Subdivision of original Lot 216 into three (3) Record Lots.
ACTION:	No objection. 6/21/78	
91	Square 1223, Lots 78 and 79 3616 N Street, N.W. John J. Splawn	Combination of Lots 78 and 79 into one Record Lot.
ACTION:	No objection. 6/14/78	

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES

27 June, 1978

1951 Constitution Avenue

Frank Miles
James Maltby

Electromagnetic Development Lab

Dick Scalessa

C & P Telephone Enclosures

Brenda Mack
Carol Hayes

3285 M Street, N.W.

Elliott Gitlin
Robert Wolpe

1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.

Arthor Cotton Moore
Thomas Bourke
Leonard Greenberg

1044 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.

Arthur Cotton Moore
Thomas Bourke

1050 Thomas Jefferson Street

Vlastimeil Koubek

1922 F Street, N.W.

Antonio Ramos

718 15th Street, N.W.

Henry Schwartz
Der Schut
Albert Swanke

1718 Crestwood Drive, N.W.

John Wiebenson
Mark McIntruff

2501 M Street, N.W.

Vlastimil Koubek

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
27 June, 1978

The meeting convened at 10:00 in the offices of the Commission of Fine Arts at 703 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:	*Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman*
	Hon. Philip W. Buchen
	Hon. Victorine du Pont Homsey
	Hon. Eli S. Jacobs
	Hon. Frederick D. Nichols
	Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Staff Present:	*Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary*
	Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
	Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
	Mr. J. L. Sibley Jennings, Jr.
	Mrs. Sue A. Kohler

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of the next meetings were set at 25 July, 22 August and 26 September, 1978.

B. Minutes of the May 1978 meeting were unanimously approved.

C. D.C. Draft Bill, "The Historic Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978". The Secretary mentioned that the District of Columbia Government was working on a draft of a bill which could duplicate the Commission's design review in the Pennsylvania Avenue and Georgetown areas through new powers delegated to the Joint Committee on Landmarks. He indicated that it would be incumbent on applicants to prove economic hardship or public good to overcome any objections to a project. The possibility of added complication to the review process plus opening the door to confusion was obvious to the Commission. Mr. Buchen indicated that changing a word from "and" to "or" when in the Commission of Fine Arts jurisdiction could eliminate duplication of review. There was also some general discussion about the preference for being advisory, rather than mandatory. The Commission instructed the Secretary to prepare a position on the proposal and to submit it to the members for review. No action was required.

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

A. <u>General Services Administration</u>

1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Renovation. The Secretary presented drawings which showed the unfinished central wing of this

building, once known as the Bureau of Indian Affairs Building, finished off in a compatible style. There were fire escapes, temporary roof-top structures, and general eyesore conditions facing Virginia Avenue just off the Washington Monument axis. A new masonry facing and pediment roof as well as a stair tower were being proposed for the unfinished stump of the building. A modest penthouse was proposed for the roof top.

The Secretary introduced Mr. Frank Miles, the GSA project coordinator, who explained the project and efforts to keep the solution simple and inexpensive. Though the members had no particular objection to the proposal, because it improved a terrible situation, and commended the addition of a pediment to match the two end wings, they questioned the exterior expression of the protruding stair tower. The Chairman asked if it would be possible to create an entire new north facade which would incorporate the stair and existing fenestration patterns. Mr. Miles indicated that just a solution had been examined and rejected because of the increased cost potential. In a discussion with the Commission, Mr. Miles was informed of the Commission's concern over the Protruding stairwell. The Commission expressed their hope that the project funds could be increased to cover an entire new facade. The Commission unanimously approved the project with the recommendation that a new facade line be established if possible. EXHIBIT A

B. Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Electromagnetic Development Laboratory, Phase III, Naval Research Lab. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings for the third of a previously approved three-phase project. He pointed out that the Commission had reviewed all master and previous plans and that the proposal was consistent with them. He introduced Mr. Richard Scalessa of the Navy who indicated that materials and details would match the existing construction. The Commission unanimously approved the project.
EXHIBIT B

C. Veterans Administration

New Logo. The Assistant Secretary presented several drawings depicting two logo styles with color and black-and-white versions of each. He indicated that the VA intended to use the full range of designs for a variety of needs. He introduced Mr. Brown of the VA staff who confirmed that the agency wanted a variety of elements to use in different ways. The members indicated their preference for a single identification logo and the use of one typeface with uppercase letters, and departure from the material submitted. Mr. Brown indicated the agency's interest in the Commission's advice and willingness to study the suggestions. The Commission unanimously approved the material subject to the above suggestions. EXHIBIT C

D. D.C. Department of Transportation

C & P Telephone Enclosures, New Design. The Assistant Secretary presented a model and some photographs of the existing telephone kiosk used in the monumental core of the city as well as the proposal. He indicated that the supply of the earlier enclosures, as approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, had run out and that it was not particularly suited to use by persons in wheel chairs. Mrs Brenda Mack of the C & P Telephone Company told the members of the need for a new design to accommodate the changing requirements within the District of Columbia. She indicated a willingness to work with the Commission, as the Phone Company had done before. The members examined the photos and the model indicating their problem with the structure as it expressed the various strength and functional characteristics. Mrs. Homsey recommended a bronze colored band at the bottom of the enclosure to match the top. Mr. Stone recommended that the vertical member supporting the entire enclosure be bronze color to indicate its support function as compared to the eggshell color side walls. Mr. Nichols suggested that the phone books were exposed to the weather by the design and that care should be taken with that detail. Mrs. Mack was amenable to all suggestions and the Commission unanimously approved the design pending the color changes on the vertical structure and the bottom trim. EXHIBIT D

E. D.C. Department of Economic Development

Old Georgetown Act

1. OG 78-113, 3285 M Street, N.W. Townhouse above Retail/Commercial Space - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings and a model of this project, indication that it was a resubmission which had received favorable recommendations from the Georgetown Board. He showed that the overall height of the project had been reduced, the single-family house character had been given to the complex as it faced Potomac and Prospect Streets, and that the shop fronts facing M Street had been reduced from a story-and-a-hald to one floor. The loading and garage ramps which had originally all faced the residential Patomac Street had been reduced from three to one, and it was close to M Street. The project, in short, had carefully responded to previous comments by the Commission and the community in a reasonable and responsible fashion. The Commission examined the model as the architect, Elliott Gitlin, and the developer, Robert Wolpe, described the project further.

A number of citizens were heard on the subject who voiced concerns over security for the complex and suggested that the Prospect Street pedestrian entrance to the townhouse units never be used for service. Otherwise the consensus of the community was that the developer and the architedt had done an excellent job of accommodating the concerns of

others.

The Commission asked several general questions of the project sponsors and the community, then approved the project unanimously for design development.

2. OG 78-116, 1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., New Residential Building - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings and a model of this resubmission, indicating that the Commission's previous comments on the project had been taken to heart, and it came with the Georgetown Board's blessings. The previous scheme had included the facade of the mid-20th century Cherry Hill apartment building within a contemporary structure. The Commission had indicated the retention of the building made the project a bit out of keeping with its mix of styles. The resubmission by the architect, Arthur Cotton Moore, included a totally new building topping the existing bank and showing a three-floor structure facing Wisconsin Avenue adjacent to the more massive Dodge Center. Mr. Moore indicated his efforts had paid off in a low-profile, small building for the waterfront and his hopes that small, rather than large, projects could make up the new construction in Georgetown. The Commission examined the material and indicated their lack of objection to razing the existing building.

Community comments came from Mr. Grosvenor Chapman who stated his lack of feeling for the project, but preference for no new development on the site. He expressed a question over the style, but no strong feelings.

The Commission examined the material and unanimously approved the project.

3. OG 78-117, 1044 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Addition and Alteration to Existing Building - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary presented a model and drawings showing how this project had been revised in terms of the Commission's previous comments. He indicated that the Georgetown Board had recommended the project for design development and that the previous recommendations for a lower building with less glass had been followed.

Mr. Arthur Cotton Moore, the architect, presented his design concept for the revisions, stating that he found the design omproved with the recommended changes. There had been some community concern over the glassiness of the project and its lack of stylistic roots. The Chairman indicated that the lower part of Wisconsin Avenue was unique with its industrial history, the patterns of of open space and vast scale differences between buildings and their periods. The Commission agreed that the unique conservatory nature of the building would contribute rather than detract from the area and unanimously approved it.

4. OG 78-118, 1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., New Office/Apartment and Garage Building. The Secretary presented a model and some drawings of the building complex located between Thomas Jefferson Street and 31st Street on the Georgetown waterfront. He indicated that the proposal included 90-foot-high structures on both streets and that the Beorgetown Board had recommended against the project as being out of scale and character with the historic district. The Board had suggested a maximum of sixty feet in height for this site because of its architectural relation to the area and the topography involved.

The architect, Vlastimil Koubek, indicated his efforts at setting the building back vertically and breaking up the masses to relieve the scale pressures in the historic district. He pointed out that a landscaped walk and court really separated the residential structure facing 31st Street and the office structure facing Thomas Jefferson Street. He indicated that he had originally recommended cast stone for the facades, but had taken the Georgetown Board's recommendation to switch to brick.

A number of community comments indicated a strong feeling against the size of the building and hopes that it could be cut down in size, as was the Inland Steel project across the street.

The members examined the materials and felt that the project was indeed much too high and bulky for the site and would lead to a diminution of the historic qualities required for preservation by the Old Georgetown Act. The Chairman explained that the Old Georgetown Act sometimes needed to go well beyond all zoning and code requirements in the interest of preserving the historic district. The Commission unanimously disapproved the project, suggesting that the maximum height be 60 feet and that the height along 31st Street where the scale was quite small should be kept to about 30 Feet.

5. Appendix 1. approved.

<u>Shipstead-Luce Act</u>

1. SL 78-47, 1922 F Street, N.W., Addition to Office Building. The Assistant Secretary presented photographs of the existing site and drawings of the proposed addition to a small, traditionally styled office building adjacent ot the George Washington University campus. The proposal would be to add in a matching vocabulary within the mid-block so as to be minimally visible from the street. The block had been quartered by four different mid-sized buildings and would be in no way altered in character by the proposal. Mr. Ramos, the architect, and several of his associated were present, but the members had no com ments or questions. They felt that the proposal was entirely in keeping with the area and unanimously approved it.

2. SL 78-50, 718 15th Street, N.W., Alteration for Addition of Entrance to the Pennsylvania Avenue Facade - Resubmission. The Secretary presented drawings and indicated that the Commission had previously disapproved a scheme for creating a substantially glass facade and entrance replacing the existing, primarily masonry wall facing the Treasury across Pennsylvania Avenue. He indicated that the Chairman and he had met several times since the May meeting with the Bank and a new scheme was being submitted which left most of the existing masonry in place around the new door and had a moderate stair and reproduction of the 15th Street entrance lamps for a monumental character. The Commission examined the material and expressed their unanimous approval to Mr. Henry Schwarz of the Bank staff.

3. SL 78-52, 1718 Crestwood Drive, N.W., New Third Floor Addition. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings, a model, and photographs of the proposal to add a floor to a traditionally-styled house facing Rock Creek Park in an area of similar homes. The Secretary indicated that he had been to the site and found it quite consistent with the traditional vernacular and that the community presented a harmonious unity to the park. Mr. John Wiebenson, the architect, indicated his interest in providing the client with enough space for their growing needs and how the addition had been somewhat box-like to permit the functional needs with the minimum profile addition to the roof. The Commission examined the material and asked if it would be possible to add to the rear of the house. Mr. Wiebenson said that the site was not too tight, but that there was a desire by the owner not to block the existing windows facing the park as well as to have a separation between the master bedroom and the children's bedrooms in the house. Mr. Nichols asked if alternatives as studied had been feasible to have a more conventional roof expression, more in keeping with that of the original house. Mr. Wiebenson indicated a strong preference for a minimal roof addition.

The Commission generally had no objection to an addition or alterations to the house. They did find the proposal a stylistic departure from the existing house and vicinity and that it could lend a jarring note that should be avoided. They unanimously disapproved the proposal.

4. SL 78-53, 2501 M Street, N.W., New Office and Apartment Building. The Secretary presented drawings for a mixed-use commercial complex to be built adjacent to several other recent projects just across Rock Creek Park form Georgetown. Mr. Vlastimil Koubek, the architect, showed the members how he had split the residential on the top three floors from the office space on the lower five floors with retail space toward M Street. He indicated that the building would have four finished sides since it faced a public recreation area to the rear and streets on two sides. The material would be buff precast stone and bronze glass. The Commission examined the materials and unanimously approved the design, subject to submission of working drawings and

material samples.

5. Appendix 2, approved.

F. D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development

Historic Subdivisions

Appendix 3, approved.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:15.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

EXHIBIT A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

10 July, 1978

Dear Mr. Steele:

At its meeting on June 27, 1978, the Commission of Fine Arts was encouraged by GSA's plans to improve the exterior appearance of 1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W. As you know, the building was originally designed to extend farther north with a facade treatment similar to the Constitution Avenue elevation, but it was never completed. It is our hope that the original scheme can be finished at some point in the future.

In the meantime, however, the changes proposed in conjunction with the new mechanical and safety requirements will generally improve the situation - with one exception; the protruding fire stair on the north end of the center wing. This could be remedied if the north wing were extended to enclose the fire stair completely. We realize this will probably increase the cost of the project somewhat, yet if the additional costs are measured against the advantages of the added interior space as well as a better architectural design, the extra cost will be more than justified at this important location on a major avenue.

Our next meeting is scheduled for July 25, 1978, and the Commission will be glad to work with your representatives and the consultants in the interim.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James F. Steele
Commissioner, Region 3
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20407

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

10 July, 1978

Dear Commander Beuby:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and approved designs for Phase III of the Electromagnetic Development Laboratory project at the Naval Research Lab during its meeting on June 27, 1978.

In addition to the approval, we would also advise matching the existing materials and trim to Phases I and II, and also recommend careful attention to landscaping and screening because of the visibility of the lab and its relation on the Potomac banks to the river and a possible future waterfront park.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Commander S. C. Beuby
Department of the Navy
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 57, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

10 July, 1978

Dear Mr. Buckalew:

The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to approve the preliminary new logo designs for the Veterans Administration during its meeting on June 27, 1978. As we told Mr. Brown during our meeting, the Commission feels the general style and design being proposed is quite good. We do have several suggestions, however.

First, our hope is that a simple upper case type face could be selected to be used consistently throughout the program. Second, the Commission would recommend a single logo design for all purposes, since this can help avoid confusion and contribute to the identity which the program seeks. If we can be of further service in the matter, we will be delighted.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. W. Buckalew
Manager, Administrative Services
U.S. Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C. 20420

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

10 July, 1978

Dear Mr. Schneider:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for new telephone enclosures during its meeting on June 27, 1978. We were pleased to have Mrs. Brenda Mack from the C & P Telephone Company attend the meeting and discuss the proposed designs with us. As you know, the Commission of Fine Arts approved the previous Capital kiosk and continues to feel it is a good design. We understand that the previous design is no longer available, and also poses problems for use by the handicapped. The new design is certainly a reasonable approach, but we have a couple of suggestions which may make the overall design more successful and appropriate for use in public space within the Nation's Capital.

First, the Commission would hope that the vertical support member of the kiosk could be the bronze color rather than the eggshell color from the ground up to the roof, and that this element would be expressed as a structural element, both on the interior and the exterior of the kiosk. Second, we feel a narrow bronze color band around the bottom of the enclosure may help visually strengthen the kiosk as well. Our feeling is that these two simple additions to the design would not have any significant impact on the cost and would strengthen the integrity of the design, and would lend a propriety to the overall product which would harmonize very well with those existing bus and telephone shelters within the District at this time.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Douglas N. Schneider
Director
D.C. Department of Transportation
415 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

June 19, 1978

Mr. J. Carter Brown
Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Brown:

Thank you for your recent letter in which you state the opposition of the Fine Arts Commission to Bill 2-238, "The Pride Environmental Services Inc., Franchise Act of 1978."

I understand your concerns and will, of course, give them careful consideration as the Council approaches the first of two scheduled votes on the bill, Tuesday, June 27.

In addition, I have asked the Secretary to the Council to transmit copies of your June 7 letter to all members of the Council, in accordance with your request that the Commission's views be made available to the full membership.

Again, I appreciate having the benefit of the Commission's position on this legislation.

Sincerely,

STERLING TUCKER
Chairman

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOTED

38 Million Plan 'or SW Includes lotel and Offices

By Paul W. Valentine
Washington Post Staff Writer

A proposal for a $38.5 million motel-ice building complex in Southwest shington moved closer to reality terday when a House subcommit- approved transfer of an obscure rcel of land for the urban renewal ject.

'o be called Federal Center Plaza, 4.2-acre complex would include a -room Holiday Inn, two eight-story ice buildings totaling 700,000 iare feet in commercial and office ce and a 1,000-car underground ga-e, according to officials of the D.C. partment of Housing and Commu-y Development. The proposal has eived little public notice.

'he project area, bounded roughly 4th, 6th and C streets and Virginia enue SW, would generate at least million a year in real estate and es tax revenues, officials said.

n its action yesterday, the fiscal l government affairs subcommittee the House District Committee ed approval of a bill transferring ti-to a 41,000-square foot land parcel the project area from the federal ernment to the District of Colum-. The transfer, approval of which is ected later this summer by the full nmittee and the House, would com-te consolidation of the 186,000-iare foot urban renewal project a.

The Redevelopment Land Agency, city's urban renewal authority, tentatively selected 500 "C" Street sociates, a limited partnership in-ding the Donohoe Construction ., the Donohoe Investment Co. and ee private investors to build the nplex.

See DEVELOPMENT, A10, Col. 5

POST - 3-21-78 P. A-1

SW to Get Big New Center

DEVELOPMENT, From A1

A public hearing on the proposal has been scheduled by the city's housing and community development department for 2 p.m. on July 25 in the RLA board room at 1325 G St. NW.

Housing department director Lorenzo Jacobs tol dthe House District subcommittee yesterday that if the 41,000-square foot land parcel transfer is approved, construction on the project could begin this fall.

The project, on the planning boards for several years, is seen by District Building officials as another manifestation of the new development boom that already has cropped up in such diverse sections of the city as West End and Friendship Heights.

Just this week, developers of Waterside Mall near the proposed Federal Center Plaza complex in Southwest Washington announced plans to build another 200,000 square feet of office and retail space.

Jerry Gregg, Federal Center Plaza project manager for Donohoe Construction Co., said yesterday the motel-office building complex should "net the city something in the vicinity of $1 million in real estate and sales taxes each year . . . and that figure is probably low."

Even though the land will be leased — not sold — by RLA, the developers will pay the real estate taxes on the land as well as a ground rent of $460.-000 a year, according to Joyce Cappon, acting chief of the commercial branch in the city's housing department.

She said the ground floors of the two office buildings will have retail shops "with open plazas between the two buildings."

Gregg said the developers have "been talking" with potential tenants of the office buildings but would not specify who they are except to say they are from both the private sector and federal government.

There is a modest memorial to FDR

STAR - 3-23-78 P. A-10

Harold O. Wang (Letters, Jun 15), who suggested that Eleano Roosevelt be remembered on th new silver dollar, made a glarin misstatement concerning a memor al to Franklin D. Roosevelt. A monument *does* exist. It is one o my favorites in this city, and one show to all my visiting guests be cause it is such a fine statement o reserve and good taste. Mr. Wang would do well to stop at the corne of Ninth and Pennsylvania Avenue NW and contemplate it.

Russell J. Parkinson
Arlington, Va.

'Park-Barrel Bill' Clears House Panel

$1.4 Billion Measure, With Something for Almost Everyone, Takes 5 Minutes

By Mary Russell
Washington Post Staff Writer

The biggest parks bill ever drafted, a $1.4 billion piece of legislation with 150 projects in 44 states, cleared the House Rules Committee in five minutes yesterday.

"Notice how quiet we are. We all got something in there," Rules Committee member Trent Lott (R-Miss.) said after the meeting.

In fact, the bill affects so many House members—about 200, or nearly half the House—that it is being called the "park-barrel" bill and hailed as a new variation in the old politics of pork that may make environmentalists as popular as the dam-building Army Corps of Engineers.

The bill is a product of the legislative ingenuity of Rep. Phillip Burton (D-Calif.), one of the House's political masterminds, who just took over the chairmanship of the Interior Committee's parks subcommittee last year.

Burton ran two years ago for majority leader, and lost by only one vote to Rep. Jim Wright (D-Tex.). He is considering running again in the next Congress, and some members have suggested privately that his ambitions and his generous parks bill are not unrelated.

The bill would increase development funds for 34 parks, historical sites and seashores, make 12 additions to wilderness areas, create 11 new national parks, historic sites and national seashores, add additional segments of eight rivers to the Wild and Scenic River class and designate four new national trails. Studies for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River class would be authorized for another 18 rivers.

For the White House, the bill would include 85 to 90 percent of President Carter's environmental program, including $750 million for his urban parks program over the next five years.

"If it had a blade of grass and a squirrel, it got in the bill," said one member who pointed out that the bill even includes money for salaries and expenses for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp.

But Burton says the park-barrel talk "offends me," and points out that the bill also contains some very controversial items, which have made some members mad.

Burton admits that he originally conceived the idea for a big omnibus parks bill as a vehicle for his own project—saving the redwoods in California by adding a large amount of acreage to the Redwoods National Park.

The redwoods bill breezed on its own, but Burton decided to keep the omnibus parks plan. "It just takes care of a hell of a lot of things that needed doing for a long time," he said.

"Time is running out on people. There is just not going to be that much open space left," Burton said.

Environmentalists are delighted with the bill. Linda Billings of the Sierra Club said the previous House parks subcommittee chairman was "reluctant to move things. He didn't like to get involved in resolving conflicts. We view this as a catch-up process."

But the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee is less enthusiastic. A staff aide said the committee would probably approve about half the bill. "No way are we going to approve this without taking a look at it," the aide said. "Burton could give omnibus a bad name."

But Burton has considered Senate committee opposition too, and is calling senators with parks in their states, asking them to pressure the committee to include the parks in the bill. Burton claims the bill that comes out of a House-Senate conference will be a lot more like his bill than the Senate version.

Despite inclusion of its program, the administration is somewhat worried about the cost of the bill, particularly for authorizations in future years. Interior Secretary Cecil D. Andrus has been meeting with Burton to see if he could scale down the legislation.

Burton did overreach somewhat. He originally tried to buy back the presidential yacht, the Sequoia, for $1 million, and make every home of a speaker of the House in the 20th century a historic site in the bill. He had to pull back on those.

But as Interior Committee Chairman Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.) said of the bill as it flew through the Interior Committee in just an hour and a half in May, "The train is on the track. It's ready to roll."

By James K.W. Atherton—The Washington Post

Rep. Phillip Burton: behind the omnibus parks bill, the saving of the Redwoods.